

Racial Terms

Whites – Aryans – Caucasians – Europeans

By John Doe

I thought I'd take the time to give everyone an explanation about all these racial terms, which is an issue I've rarely seen cleared up properly. I will be focusing mostly on what is known as the White Race.

INTRODUCTION

There are a lot of terms developed for the various races. ^[1] Although I will specifically address the white race, I'm going to mention terms for the other races here. A race-concept and naming of races begins upon encounter, as it had occurred among Ancient Egyptians, Greeks, Indians, etc. ^[2]

The "blacks" can also be called Negroid, Congoid (assuming they actually originated in the Congo), and you may also have noticed an outdated term "Ethiopian" in old texts ^[3]. Sometimes Australian Aborigines are split off (Thomas Huxley began this) and referred to as Australoids ^[4].

There is no clear term for "Native Americans", the only other well-known alternatives being Amerindian or Indian ^[5]. As for Asians (referring, of course, to those such as Chinese and Vietnamese), obviously we have Mongoloid, "yellow", Oriental, Mongolian, etc. It is not unreasonable to split the Asian Race into "North Mongoloid" and "South Mongoloid" ^[6].

WHITE

The term "white" has no clear source, but originated in the 1600s and 1700s among Europeans to describe themselves in a racial sense. Obviously, it was a reaction to encountering Africans, Asians, and Arabs, (especially due to the Atlantic slave trade) and instinctually realizing racial difference upon the encounter. ^[7] Racial consciousness arises when one race first encounters another, it is a feeling and idea which is latent in all humans, and has a genetic (possibly also spiritual) origin. ^[8] Personally, I don't like the term white because it refers to skin color (although I suppose that's one of the most easily observed aspects of a race), but it is too popular to completely abandon.

CAUCASIAN

The term "Caucasian", originates with the 1800s anthropologist, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, who came to the conclusion that the original humans (he believed these were whites) originated in the Caucasus Mountains. This was basically only based on the fact that he thought those people were the most beautiful, so they must have been at the birthplace of humanity (obviously a religious and opinionated view). ^[9] This term and this theory became popular, even though it

was actually incorrect.

Later anthropologists insisted on believing this theory and found a some evidence to back it. Eventually a concept was developed in which it was considered a fact that the first and only whites were Indo-Europeans.^[10] It was disputed as to their origin, but the most popular theories were a continuation of the old idea, that they originated in the Caucasus Mountains (sometimes called the Kurgan hypothesis, a name based on some archaeological finds^[11]) or that they originated in Germany (this is why an alternative name is Indo-Germanic)^[12]. There were multiple other theories based on various arguments and evidence: the British Isles, Scandinavia, Tibet, India, the Balkans, Russian Steppes, etc.^[13] There's no clear answer. What is clear however, is that despite its popularity, the term Caucasian is outdated and incorrect. From what I've researched, it's also most likely that whites did not originate outside of Europe.^[14]

Two variations of the term Caucasian are Caucasoid and Europid.^[15]

I also want to mention that some anthropologists came to the (in my opinion foolish) conclusion that because Semites (Arabs, Jews, and many Turks) and Indians share some anthropological (facial) features with Europeans, that those people should be lumped in as Caucasians. This is unreasonable considering how race-mixed those people clearly are.^[16]

ARYAN

I'm going to start off with stating that this does not at all mean "blond, blue-eyed people", as many mentally degenerate Liberals and Jews insist it means.^[17] That is just some pathetic propaganda from them; even a site normally biased against National Socialists and untrustworthy, Wikipedia, currently admits it is a "popular myth".^[18] Nowhere in any National Socialist works (*Mein Kampf*, *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*, *Germany Reborn*, etc.^[19]) have I ever read any such thing being stated as what our Jewish-owned media states.^[20] Now that that's cleared up...

The term Aryan originates with our (Aryan/white/Caucasian) prehistoric ancestors. The first whites were probably the Cro-Magnon people, which first appeared in Europe.^[21] In later times, the Proto-Indo-European people (ancestors of all current Indo-Europeans) developed at some location, which is still disputed as I explained earlier. These Indo-Europeans migrated to various locations including Egypt, the Middle East, Iran, India, China, etc.^[22] They were, by our standards, a noble race. Their main values were honor, courage, loyalty, truthfulness, industriousness, etc.^[23] Upon encountering other races they decided to call themselves Aryans, a word which means "noble" or "worthy", sometimes also meaning "a member of one's own group".^[24] This was an ethnic-racial term, and it can be seen used in ancient writings from the Zoroastrians and the Hindus.^[25]

In the 1800s, Max Muller first wrote about the Aryans, and used the word as in "Aryan Race".^[26] He actually meant it in another manner (referring to a linguistic-ethnic group, not a race), but other anthropologists began using it to refer to a race, most often the Nordic sub-race. They argued that this was biologically the highest racial type.^[27]

The term Aryan was eventually increasingly used to refer to the majority of the European race.^[28] Madison Grant decided to discard the term (along with the term Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon) and replaced it with the word Nordic.^[29] Like William Ripley before him, he divided the Europeans into 3 sub-races: Mediterranean, Nordic (which, irrationally, did not include many Slavic Nordics, mostly just “Anglo-Saxons”), and Alpine.^[30]

An lengthy explanation of the Slavic issue is necessary to present:

The people who believe Slavs aren't true whites or of a type very distinct from other Europeans base their ideas off of old early Twentieth Century attitudes and science. Scientists like Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, William Ripley, Hans Gunther, etc. held the view that Slavs were a separate race they called the Alpine Race (Average features are broad-headedness and brown hair).^[31] This race was believed by many to be inferior to other Europeans or mixed with Mongoloids (Tartars, Mongols, etc.).^[32] Other people believe this simply because ideologists and philosophers like Hitler, Rosenberg, Spengler, Yockey, etc. viewed Slavs as either as separate race or as inferior (in a similar manner to the scientists mentioned earlier).^[33]

Many (but of course not all) German National Socialists were anti-Slavic because of: 1. influence of scientists 2. influence of philosophers 3. German attitude of the time was anti-Slavic^[34] 4. Communism was widespread among Slavs at the time. But it is notable that Rosenberg seems to portray a pro-Slavic attitude in his *Memoirs*^[35], written at the end of World War 2, and that the Germans recruited and were friendly to many anti-Communist Slavs.^[36] It seems likely that much of the National Socialist anti-Slavic ideas were propaganda to encourage Germans to put more effort into fighting Eastern European Communists.

This negative view of Slavs is incorrect. Actually, the Mongols did not normally mix with or rape Slavs, they simply went to force them to pay tribute (gold). Alfred Rambaud writes in his book *Russia* on this issue:

“As to the amount of Mongol or Tatar blood mixed with the blood of the Russians, it must have been very small : the aristocracy of the two countries may have contracted marriages, a certain number of mourzas may have become Russian princes by their conversion to orthodoxy, but the two races, as a whole, remained strangers. Even to-day, while the autochthonous Finns continue to be Russified, the Tatar cantons, even though converted to Christianity, are still Tatar.”^[37]

The Tartars and other groups only mixed with certain select groups of Slavs (such as certain Russian groups near the Urals).^[38] Overall, the majority of Slavs have little or no mixture. Also, there is no clear Alpine Race and there are a lot of Slavs who are actually long-headed or completely Nordic.^[39]

The anti-Slavic philosophers were culturally/ethnically biased, ignorant, or influenced by the scientists. Anyone who still holds anti-Slavic views today either hasn't thought critically about the views of the scientists/philosophers whose works they read, is ignorant of true racial history and anthropology, or is irrational.

SUB-RACES

I want to explain here that there are many issues with these sub-racial divisions of Europeans. First of all, the Alpine Race is not a clear race, and when thought about logically, should not even be considered a European sub-group of importance at all. Grant, Ripley, Stoddard, etc. believed that the majority of Eastern Europeans were of the Alpine type ^[40], which often was considered an inferior “peasant race”. Clearly (although lots of Eastern Europeans were peasants) this was an incorrect concept, as the truth is that north-eastern Europeans (Baltics, Russians, Poles, Finns, etc.) are mainly of the Nordic sub-race, while south-eastern Europeans (Romanians, Serbs, Croatians, etc.) are of the Mediterranean sub-race, with some partially Nordic people here and there. “Alpines” are scattered around, but most of what are clear “Alpines” are actually a minority of Eastern Europeans who are mixed with Mongoloids. ^[41]

Another matter which needs to be noted: Some anthropologists actually divided Europeans into a large number of small “sub-races”, based on minute differences in features. ^[42] This is not reasonable, because just as there are clear and distinguishable features separating each individual family in an ethnicity or nation, one would not consider the thousands of families making up that nation when dealing with that nation, but rather the whole and its general characteristics.

There are actually only two clear and practical European racial divisions, based on appearance and character: the Mediterraneans and the Nordics (there are a lot of hybrids in places like Britain, France, Spain, northern Italy, Southern Germany, etc.). ^[43]

LINGUISTICS AND RACE

We’re back to the Indo-Europeans issue. Many linguists, anthropologists, scientists, etc. of the late 19th Century and early 20th Century viewed Hungarians and Finns, who were Finno-Ugric, Georgians, and Basques, all of whom are not Indo-Europeans, (there were actually other groups as well) as inferior and race-mixed simply because of the ridiculous assumption that only Indo-Europeans can actually be whites. ^[44] This even influenced anthropological conclusions about them. ^[45] Obviously, if studied in a rational way, both common observation as well as anthropology would conclude that those ethnicities are of the European/white/Aryan race. If the ancient Aryans themselves saw Finns, they would include them into their racial type. ^[46] However among anthropologists, bias, mainly from hostility to Eastern Europeans, replaced rational analysis.

CONCLUSION

It doesn’t matter too much what you call our race regardless of whether the term is incorrect or not, as long as it’s rational and people know what you mean.

Personally, I believe there’s something special about using the term Aryan for the name of our race instead of anything else. It has an effect on us, as it brings out something ancient in our racial memory. ^[47]

ENDNOTES

[1] I can predict easily that some ignorant or misinformed people will react by asserting that race does not exist or has been proven by certain intellectuals to not be a valid division of humanity. This is absurd and lacking in common sense and logic, as well as error or dishonesty on the part of those certain intellectuals. I could recommend the works of an incredible amount of scientists, both old and recent, who prove the reality as well as the usefulness of racial divisions (along with the sources cited in here). As a beginning, I will simply suggest that the reader researches the work of Arthur R. Jensen, J. Phillip Rushton, Earnest Albert Hooton, Glayde Whitney, George W. Critz, and William Shockley.

[2] There are numerous ancient sources differentiating between races and ethnicities among many ancient cultures. Examples for ancient Egypt where mention of different races is present are the *Book of Gates* and Akhenaten's *Hymn to Aten*. Examples for ancient Greece include distinguishing between and descriptions of racial types by Xenophon and Herodotus. One example for the Persians is the reference to Negroes in Chapter XIV, B in the Zoroastrian *Bunahishn* text. For some more information covering this issue see:
Miele, Frank and Sarich, Vincent. *Race: The Reality of Human Differences*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2004.

[3] Most dictionaries state that it is an archaic term for Negro.
"Ethiopian." *Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*. HarperCollins Publishers. 2009.

[4] Huxley, Thomas H. "On the Geographical Distribution of the Chief Modifications of Mankind". *The Journal of the Ethnological Society of London*, New Series, vol. 2, 1870, pp. 404-11.

[5] "Amerindian." *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*. 2003. Houghton Mifflin Company.

[6] "Mongoloid." *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*. 2003. Houghton Mifflin Company.

[7] Miele, Frank and Sarich, Vincent. *Race: The Reality of Human Differences*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2004.

[8] One source of ideas about the spiritual side of race is Alfred Rosenberg's *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts* (*The Myth of the Twentieth Century*), first published in München: Hoheneichen. 1930.

[9] Blumenbach, Johann Friedrich. *De generis humani varietate nativa* (*On the Natural Variety of Mankind*). University of Göttingen. 3rd ed. 1795, trans. Bendyshe (1865).

[10] Houston Stewart Chamberlain points out in his *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* (2nd ed., published by John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1912) that this is a mistake since there were people who were Aryan in race but were not Indo-European. He mentions specifically that there are prehistoric peoples that could be given as examples, but there are also modern examples such as the Finnish people.

[11] Mallory, J. P. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London: Thames & Hudson. 1989.

[12] Geiger, Lazarus. *Ursprung und Entwicklung der menschlichen Sprache und Vernunft*. Stuttgart: Cotta 1871.

[13] Mallory, J. P. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London: Thames & Hudson. 1989.

[14] Renfrew, Andrew Colin. *Before Civilisation: The Radiocarbon Revolution and Prehistoric Europe*. London: Pimlico. 1973.

[15] An example of one book using the common scientific term Euroid is:
Baker, John R. *Race*. National Vanguard Books, 1st edition. 1974.

[16] This mistake is made among both older as well as more recent scholars. An example is from H.G. Wells' famous book *The Outline of History* (New York: Doubleday & Co. 1920), which is still a very useful book.

[17] One example of this could not suffice, considering that this idea of the term Aryan supposedly meaning "blond-blue eyed people" for the "Nazis" is so ridiculously common among both average people as well as intellectual circles. It is even repeated in documentaries on the "History Channel" on television.

[18] The last time I checked the Wikipedia's article on "Nazism", it said that (and would be correct). However, Wikipedia is unstable in its information because of people frequently editing articles.

[19] I referred here to the top three most important National Socialist books: Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (1925), Alfred Rosenberg's *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* (1930), and Hermann Goering's *Germany Reborn* (1934). Of course, the "blond-blue eye" idea of Aryan is not present in any other of the numerous National Socialist works I've read.

[20] The Jewish influence in various fields is extremely important to recognize, and has been studied and revealed by many intellectuals for over a century (more recent ones including Professor Kevin MacDonald and Professor Tomislav Sunic). For information on Jewish ownership and/or manipulation of the majority of mass media sources see: Duke, David. *Jewish Supremacism*. Free Speech Press. 2001.

[21] There are many sources showing that Cro-Magnons were the first of the 'Caucasian Race'.

Three well-known ones are:

Kemp, Arthur. *March of the Titans*. Ostara Publications. 1999;

Grant, Madison. *The Passing of the Great Race*, Scribner's 4th revised edition, 1932;

Coon, Carleton S. *The Races of Europe*. Greenwood, USA. 1972.

[22] Mallory, J. P. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London: Thames & Hudson. 1989.

[23] "Our standards" of course refers to European traditional values that were carried on from ancient times to the Middle Ages to the Colonial era. Some information on this and religious connections can be found from:

Gunther, Hans F.K. *The Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans*. Clair Press, London. 1967.

[24] Mallory, J.P. and Adams, D.Q. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2006

[25] Bailey, Harold Walter. "Arya". *Encyclopedia Iranica*, 2, New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1989;

Tilak, Lokamanya Bâl Gangâdhar. *The Arctic Home in the Vedas*. Poona City, India, 1903.

[26] Muller, Max, *Biographies of Words and the Home of the Aryas* (1888), Kessinger Publishing reprint, 2004.

[27] Lapouge, Georges Vacher de. *L'Aryen et son rôle social (The Aryan and his Social Role)*. University of Michigan Library. 1899.

[28] An example is Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who in his *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* (2nd ed., published by John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1912), explains how Germans, Latins, Slavs, Celts, and Greeks are all Aryan.

[29] Grant, Madison. *The Passing of the Great Race*, Scribner's 4th revised edition, 1932.

[30] Ibid.;

William Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe: A Sociological Study*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1899. Note that Ripley uses the term 'Teutonic' rather than Nordic or Aryan. A common alternative to 'Teutonic race' was 'Anglo-Saxon race', which referred to the Nordics. The majority of Slavs were excluded because they were assumed to be largely of 'Alpine' type.

[31] See, for example, the description of Alpines in Madison Grant's *The Passing of the Great Race*.

[32] One work where this concept is referenced is: Gunther, Hans F. K. *The Racial Elements of European History*. Methuen, 1927.

[33] Oswald Spengler (*The Decline of the West*. London, George Allen & Unwin. 1928) and Francis Parker Yockey (*Imperium*. Brittas Bay, Ireland. 1948) refer to Slavs as non-

European “Asiatics” and “colored”. Alfred Rosenberg, in his *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* expresses the concept that Slavs are mixed with Mongoloids and Hitler expresses in *Mein Kampf* a cultural hostility as well as the idea that they are a separate racial type.

[34] Liulevicius, Vejas Gabriel. *The German Myth of the East: 1800 to the Present*. Oxford Studies in Modern European History.

[35] Rosenberg, Alfred. *Memoirs*. Chicago & NY: Ziff-Davis Pub. Co. 1949. I refer to statements he makes in the section on his youth. He explains how he is grateful to a Polish student who helped with algebra and also expresses a positive attitude toward the fact that his school was made up of a mixture of various Slavic groups.

[36] François de Lannoy: *Les Cosaques de Pannwitz: 1942–1945*. Bayeux: Heimdal, 2000. Anti-Communist Cossacks recruited by the Germans is one of many examples of this.

[37] Rambaud, Alfred. *Russia*. Leonora B. Lang, tr., vol. 1. New York: Collier, 1900.

[38] Platonov, S. F. *Lektsii po russkoi istorii (Lectures on Russian History)*. 3 vols. St. Petersburg: Stolichnaia staropechatnia, vol. 1. 1899

[39] "From Kossinna to Bromley: ethnogenesis in Slavic archaeology." *In On Barbarian Identity. Critical Approaches to Ethnicity in the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Andrew Gillett (Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 4), pp. 201-218. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.

[40] Grant, Madison. *The Passing of the Great Race*, Scribner's 4th revised edition, 1932; William Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe: A Sociological Study*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1899; Stoddard, Lothrop. *The Revolt against Civilization*, Scribner's, 1922.

[41] Carleton S. Coon in his *The Races of Europe* (Greenwood, USA. 1972) points out some groups that have mixture. But no scientific work is needed to learn this; one can observe clearly mixed types by studying pictures of different groups of Russians, Ukrainians, etc.

[42] An example of this sort of thing is presented in: Deniker, Joseph. *Les Races de l'Europe (The Races of Europe)*. Paris, Association Française pour l'avancement des Sciences. 1907.

[43] The concept of division into two groups was made popular in the academic world by Thomas H. Huxley, due to his article “On the Geographical Distribution of the Chief Modifications of Mankind” (*The Journal of the Ethnological Society of London*, New Series, vol. 2, 1870, pp. 404-11.) in which he divided the ‘Caucasian race’ into Xanthocroi, fair people, and Melanochroi, darker people, and acknowledged a mix in Southern Europe. However, he did not present any other features in this division besides skin, hair, and eye color variations. It would have been more useful had he pointed out differences in skull shape and facial features.

[44] Mish, Frederic C., Editor in Chief *Webster's Tenth New Collegiate Dictionary* Springfield,

Massachusetts, U.S.A.:1994--Merriam-Webster See original definition (definition #1) of "Aryan" in English.

[45] See note #10 where I explain how Houston S. Chamberlain indicated this in certain points in his book, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*.

[46] As explained earlier, the term 'Aryan' was used in an ethnic-racial sense by ancient Indo-European peoples. If, for example, the upper-caste Aryans of ancient Indian society would somehow have the chance to encounter a Finnish person, they would consider that person to be of their own type because of the racial similarity, despite any linguistic or cultural differences.

[47] The idea of racial memory was made popular by Jack London in fictional works such as *Before Adam* (New York, Grosset & Dunlap. 1907). An idea related to this is presented by Carl G. Jung in the *Psychology of the Unconscious* (New York, Moffat Yard and Company. 1916.) where he expounds the concept of "primordial vision". Jung explains that racial memories are feelings, ideas, images, or memories inherited from one's ancestors through a "collective unconscious".